

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-33 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 14, 19 and 26 are independent claims.

**35 U.S.C. §112, FIRST PARAGRAPH REJECTION**

Claims 1-33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Examiner asserts that the newly-added feature of independent claims 1, 14, 19 and 26 that a pseudo-grant signal is generated to all requesting master units at the same time is not supported by the original specification. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to the HGRANT1 and HGRANT2 signals of Figure 6 and paragraph [0030] of the original specification, which are clearly indicated as being generated at the same time.

In light of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph rejection is respectfully requested.

**35 U.S.C. §101 REJECTION**

Claims 25 and 33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that with respect to this rejection, the Examiner's logic is fatally flawed. In particular, dependent claims 25 and 33 depend from independent claims 19 and 26, respectively. If independent claims 19 and 26 are directed to statutory subject matter, then all dependent claims dependent therefrom must also be directed to statutory subject matter.

In light of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection is respectfully requested.

**35 U.S.C. §102(b) KENNY REJECTION**

Claims 1-10, and 13-33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,393,503 to Kenny. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In the response of April 21, 2006 Applicants asserted that an arbiter in example embodiments generates a pseudo-grant signal to all requesting master units at the same time, whereas, the arbiter in Kenny does not.

In response, on pages 11-13 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner repeatedly refers to “concurrent ownership,” concurrent data transfer,” and “concurrent transactions” as being taught by Kenny.

Although Applicants do not disagree that Kenny may teach these concurrent acts, it is clear from Figure 9A that Kenny does not concurrently provide a pseudo-grant signal. As is clear from Figure 9A, the pseudo-grant signal supplied to CPU interface control 5, PCI controller 7, and GRPH 8 namely, GRANT CHLNA, GRANT CHLNB and GRANT CHLNC are not provided at the same times, namely, T1, T3 and T5 and further do not overlap at all, and are therefore are not even concurrent as the Examiner asserts.

In contrast, the arbiter in example embodiments generates pseudo grant signals, HGRANT, HGRANT 2 to all requesting master units, for example, master units 1 and 2 at the same time, as shown in Figure 6 of the present application.

In light of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection is respectfully requested.

**35 U.S.C. §103(a) KENNY REJECTION**

Claims 11 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kenny. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 11 and 12 are patentable by virtue of their dependency on allowable independent claim 1, for at least the reasons set forth above.

**CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of each of claims 1-33 in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact John A. Castellano at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By

\_\_\_\_\_  
John A. Castellano, Reg. No. 35,094

P.O. Box 8910  
Reston, Virginia 20195  
(703) 668-8000

JAC/pw